



Delaware Nutrient Management



The Delaware Nutrient Management Commission Planning Subcommittee Minutes of the Meeting Held February 7, 2006

In attendance:

<i>Committee Members Present</i>	<i>Others Present</i>
D. Baker, Planning Chair	S. Hollenbeck
T. Keen	T. Garrahan
C. Larimore	M. Guo
C. Solberg	P. Sample
E. Lewandowski	G. Binford
<i>Committee Members Absent</i>	K. Foskey
B. Schilling	B. Vanderwende
<i>Ex-officios Present</i>	K. Maciorowski
W. Rohrer, Jr.	

This meeting was properly notified and posted as required by law.

Call to Order/Welcome:

Chairman D. Baker called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

Approval of Minutes:

C. Larimore motioned to approve the minutes from the January 10, 2006 Planning Subcommittee meeting. Motion seconded by T. Keen.

E. Lewandowski noted a correction on Page 3. The word “rescued” should be “recused”.

The motion was amended to include the correction and passed unanimously.

Discussion and Action Items:

Review and act on Research and Demonstration Proposals:

B. Rohrer provided the following summary of actions from the last Planning Subcommittee meeting:

- Eight proposals were reviewed
 - Two were approved, “*Advancing Nutrient Management in Delaware*” and “*Effective Setbacks for Controlling Nutrient Runoff*”
 - Four proposals were disapproved.
 - Two proposals were tabled to address questions that had been raised
- There is about \$30,000 available in the Research and Demonstration line.
- The Planning Subcommittee may need to review the budget in order to identify additional funding as the two tabled proposals exceed \$30,000. It is noted available funding in the Research and Demonstration budget may not need to be the deciding factor for approval of the proposals as there may be another option.

- The two proposals tabled were, “*Biological Poultry Litter Management (BPLM)*” and “*Utilization of Poultry Litter as Activated Carbon Sources*”

1. **“*Biological Poultry Litter Management (BPLM)*”, \$25,000:**

- This proposal was tabled at the last meeting because additional funding had been requested from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) for the project and had not been awarded. It was noted that 20 proposals were presented to the NFWF.
- K. Maciorowski reported he has received invitation from the NFWF for the full round of proposals. He further reported the NFWF amended their decision date to May 1, 2006. The full project is an \$847,424 effort of which \$25,000 has been requested from Nutrient Management as matching funds.
- E. Lewandowski asked when the match commitment needed to be demonstrated. K. Maciorowski reported this has not been identified although it is his interpretation the match commitment would be needed sometime during the first year of the grant.
- E. Lewandowski asked when the funds would be available. K. Maciorowski reported the project is to start June 2006. The first monies should become available at that time.
- B. Rohrer noted a question was raised at the last Planning Subcommittee meeting in reference to aluminum based amendments to the litter. There is concern if PLT or another product is used the results may be different. K. Maciorowski reported any control product is acceptable as long as it is commonly used on the shore. The main focus of the proposal is to demonstrate the litter management system and how to prove stabilization of nitrogen, phosphorus and production.
- B. Rohrer noted if PLT is used in one house and an aluminum product in another the results would be different. It is important to assure a fair comparison. K. Maciorowski reported an aluminum product could be used as the sole control.
- K. Maciorowski shared specifics of the proposal. Ideally, there will be two houses for control and two houses for treatment. The litter will be applied. C. Solberg stated this is the most attractive part of the proposal. The project is a three-year project. Field data should be available after a three-year cycle.
- C. Solberg asked if the test frequencies and depths have been peer reviewed so the protocol would be considered valid by DNREC (Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control) in order to be held against the loading rates for the TMDLs. K. Maciorowski stated protocol has been set through growers in Arkansas and R. Hostick both of which work with the litter management system. C. Solberg noted L. Jones is one of the reviewers and suggested obtaining the frequency of sampling and quantity of the dependent variable of ground water sampling suitable to project the loading rate of the land use from the Watershed Assessment section. K. Maciorowski noted that he has not received comments from L. Jones as of yet, but anticipates it.
- C. Solberg noted a previous discussion in reference to the purchase of equipment and is unsure if there is still concern. B. Rohrer stated the \$25,000 being requested would be applied to spray rigs, scale biomass extractor and a litter tiller. Concern was shared because the funding requested should be more service orientated instead of the capital cost of the project. K. Maciorowski stated the funding could be applied anywhere.
- T. Keen stated at a past meeting a gentleman commented he would have a 50% reduction in phosphorus. He noted that alum would not be a problem as long as the Ph drops to four or five. T. Keen stated there was some irrigated corn in Accomack County, Virginia in which alum treated poultry manure had been applied in a no till situation and the crop went under. This was an experimental situation and the integrator would not divulge how much alum had been applied so it could have been a tremendous amount. H. Wilson from Paynter came in to look at it toxic. Ph on the farm was running at six. It was concluded that had the field been tilled it would not have happened. Therefore, T. Keen suggested including no till plots in the

project. K. Maciorowski stated he was not sure how many plots the projects could afford, but could certainly look at some no till plots. It is not clear that the project could look at till vs. no till due to the number of replicates necessary, but could look at no till.

- C. Solberg stated the approval of the proposal should be based on the contingency of receiving funding from NFWF. D. Baker agreed and asked B. Rohrer if the funding was not approved could the funds be carried over. B. Rohrer noted the line has been earmarked for a one-year continuation.

D. Baker noted if both proposals are approved it would exceed funding available in the budget. He asked B. Rohrer to give an explanation should both proposals be approved as to how the additional funding could be met.

B. Rohrer referred to the Nutrient Management Planning Cost Share Breakdown report (attached to minutes). He reported this year is a light year for nutrient management planning and are still using 2005 funding. The light years had been determined by the Commission. He noted the 2005 funding has an expiration date of this summer and is not confident that all funds will be utilized based on the plans coming into the office. Therefore, B. Rohrer recommends transferring funding from the 2005 planning line into another line which would cover additional projects or possibly cover the second year of the funding request for of the temporary storage proposal. This is something the Planning subcommittee should consider.

B. Rohrer offered to provide details of the planning activities. D. Baker asked if this topic would be for the Planning Subcommittee or for the Budget Subcommittee. B. Rohrer stated it would be for both as there are two needs. The first need is for the Planning Subcommittee to determine research and development priority needs in order to make the transfer. The Planning Subcommittee also needs to determine if funds need to be transferred to another line of the budget. The second is it is budgetary in nature. In order to implement a transfer several questions would need to be answered. There would also be some meetings with the Budget Office. Justification could be not the Nutrient Management Program would not have to ask the Joint Finance Committee (JFC) for additional funding. This would also alleviate some stress the Budget Office as they are determining who will be going to the JFC for additional funding this year.

B. Rohrer reported there is \$300,000 for 2005 in the planning line and at this time nothing has been utilized for 2006. Discussion ensued concerning budget forecasting. B. Rohrer's concern is for the \$300,000 in 2005 because the funding will expire this summer. This funding is available since it was encumbered into a purchase order for planning reimbursement. C. Solberg asked based on the fact that the monies are encumbered into a purchase order would the funding be available for budget adjustments. B. Rohrer stated it would require strong justification and meetings with the Budget Office. B. Rohrer stated it was worth the effort so that the Nutrient Management Program does not lose any funding.

E. Lewandowski asked if B. Rohrer wanted the Planning Subcommittee to recommend this action to the Budget Subcommittee or the Full Commission. B. Rohrer stated the Budget Subcommittee should be involved. He further stated the Planning Subcommittee needs to identify the demand.

B. Rohrer noted he has made several contacts in reference to securing funding for the second year of the temporary storage project. He has not received any responses. C. Solberg noted some of the Commissioners need to contact these individuals as the project would show valuable information in reference to setbacks. It is his opinion that the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) should offer funding for the second year. B. Rohrer noted the MDA is very excited about the project and with the fact the Commission had approved funding for the first year. He further noted the individuals he has been in contact with is looking for money to support the project and has even looked to the USEPA

(United States Environmental Protection Agency) as a possible funding source. B. Rohrer noted the task is complex not to mention the sensitivity of the topic.

E. Lewandowski asked if funding was transferred to the Research and Development line would it be available for another round of Request for Proposals (RFPs). B. Rohrer stated four rounds have been set up.

C. Solberg recommended the Planning Subcommittee to determine the Commissions priority as it relates to research and development over the next few years as far as data. B. Rohrer noted one area of priority is poultry litter in a no till situation but have not received a proposal for this research priority. D. Baker stated at this point the Commission should not limit itself through the budget.

C. Solberg motioned to consider the proposal for Biological Litter Management with a placeholder contingency from the NFWF through the approval of funding made available to University of Delaware, the inclusion of protocol to include the use of alum as the control, receipt of reply from L. Jones, Watershed Assessment as to the adequacy of the water quality information that will come from the project and the product of the grant is information and report of practices with no accrual of good and services beyond the life of the grant. P. Sample seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2. “Utilization of Poultry Litter as Activated Carbon Sources”, 23,748:

- It was noted this proposal was tabled after reviewing the five objectives. M. Guo was requested to modify the proposal by eliminating objective four, “compare properties and performance with selected commercially available activated carbons”. The elimination would modify the budget request. M. Guo could no lower than \$20,000 without major revisions to the proposal.
- Based on past discussions the elimination of the fourth objective along with other modifications would have little impact on the cost of the proposal.
- Discussion ensued in reference to the elimination of the fourth objective along with the other modifications. M. Guo shared details of these changes.
- D. Baker asked for clarification as to why objective four was removed as it would be of value to know what the release of contaminants would be. C. Solberg stated unless it was a misunderstanding as he does not see any concern. B. Rohrer stated at the time it was a money issue. After reviewing all the five objectives it fit the research priorities the least.
- C. Solberg asked between today’s basic research and efficacy of converting pellets to activated carbon what timeline is imagined to have a functional alternative use for the pellets on a commercial scale. M. Guo states further research would be needed with the establishment of a plant and estimates two to three years.
- P. Sample shared his support for the proposal.

Based on the discussion, D. Baker asked for a motion to accept the proposal as presented. **C. Solberg motioned to accept the proposal.**

T. Keen asked if everyone received a copy of the letter in which there is a desire to build a poultry litter burning ethanol plant in Princess Anne and is looking for 100,000 tons of manure to burn as a power source. He further noted they are will be looking to pay \$20 a ton. If fertilizer is taken away from those who are utilizing it now there will be a need for compensation. P. Sample stated this was not the decision on the table. T. Keen understands this is not the decision on the table but has a concern for those who would not have access to manure in the future. P. Sample stated that would be a decision at a later date. C. Solberg noted it would only raise the value of the manure.

Hearing no further discussion, D. Baker asked for a second. **P. Sample seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

B. Rohrer reported the next deadline for proposals is July 1, 2006. The RFP may be modified in order to receive additional proposals. B. Rohrer noted \$100,000-\$125,000 is in jeopardy in the planning line and recommends transferring the funds to another line whether this would be to the Research and Demonstration line or Relocation. C. Solberg stated Research and Development would be the best use for the money. B. Rohrer noted timing is critical.

E. Lewandowski motioned for B. Rohrer to secure additional funding for Research and Development.

E. Lewandowski noted approval from the Budget Office is necessary before considering amendments to the budget.

With a motion on the table, D. Baker asked for a second. **C. Larimore seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

Discuss NM Planning Activities and Budget for Reimbursement:

B. Rohrer noted this as an agenda item for the next Full Commission meeting as discussed this evening.

Public Comments:

NONE

Next Meeting

NONE

Adjournment

Chairman D. Baker adjourned meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Approved,

David Baker, Chair
Planning Subcommittee

BRR/mrp